APPENDIX OK FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

ART. I.— LOGICAL NATTJKE OF THE THEISTIO AKGUMENT,

OP TEXT.)

WE are not entitled to demand of every one who Relieves in the being of a God, that he should he ahle to give an analysis of the argument which has convinced him. Every logician is prepared to acknowledge, that to have a reason for our conviction is one thing, and to he ahle to develop it is a different thing. It is hy a spontaneous process that the mind is led to "believe in the existence of God ; to state the argument in regular form is the business of natural theology as a science. In fulfilling its full office, this science should unfold certain external facts, and also certain internal principles. In this country, for an age or two prior to the middle of the present century, it was chiefly employed in bringing out the external element, and has furnished a beautiful exhibition of the adaptation of parts to be found in the universe. In another department of this same external evidence much less was done. The ancients argued the existence of God, not only from the *adaptation* but from the *order* of the universe. This branch of proof must come once more into prominence in consequence of the late discoveries in natural history, in regard to the homologies and homotypes found in the vegetable and animal structures (see pp. 120-126). The argument will be strengthened, when it is taken, as it can now be, from COMBINED ORDEK AND ADAPTATION. (See p. 158, and alse " Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation.") But what is it which entitles us to rise from these facts to the belief in God ? In answering this question we are led to discover, that in a full statement of the argument it is needful to enunciate certain intuitive principles. This circumstance, however, should not be urged to ehow that a statement of the traces of design is useless, for it is upon the external facts that the intuition proceeds, and it is when these are before the mind that the mtuition is called into exercise, and produces the conviction. More doubters have been convinced by Paley, than by all the elaborate works on the metaphysics of the •'.ttqgBBteiit. Still, in a professedly complete exhibition of the process, the internal principles should be enunciated. There is unfortunately not an absolute agreement among metaphysicians as to what these are— which disagreement of the analysis is Ijy no means to be urged as an argument against the reality of the principles them-
Some maintain that we have an immediate consciousness of God, or an